



PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. AMAT/4666/ETCH/CHMBR/JB

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:
Mohn, et al.

Serial No.: 09/611,817

Confirmation No.: 6787

Filed: July 7, 2000

For: Multi-Purpose Processing
Chamber With Removable
Chamber Liner

MAIL STOP AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

ମନ୍ଦିର ମନ୍ଦିର ମନ୍ଦିର ମନ୍ଦିର ମନ୍ଦିର

Group Art Unit: 1763

Examiner: Anna M. Crowell

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited on November 21, 2003 with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

11/21/03

Kurt & Linda

Dear Sir:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On November 18, 2003, a telephonic interview was held between Keith Tackett (an attorney of record for Applicant) and Examiner Crowell regarding the meaning of a phrase contained in claim 1, and patentability of independent claim 1. No agreement regarding claim interpretation or patentability was reached.

Applicant and Examiner Crowell specifically discussed claim 1 and figures 3 and 6 of this application. Applicant explained that claim 1 and other claims recite “a chamber body having an internal volume defined by first and second substantially cylindrical regions and by side walls extending substantially tangent between the first and second substantially cylindrical regions,” and that the recited language inherently refers to the internal volume defined by the inner walls of the cylindrical regions and the inner walls of the sidewalls as shown in Figs. 3 and 6A-6C. Thus, claim 1 as submitted by Applicant inherently means that the inner surfaces of the sidewalls are substantially tangent to the inner surfaces of the cylindrical regions. Examiner Crowell concluded that claim 1 does

not inherently refer to inner surfaces as asserted by Applicant. Examiner Crowell asserted that claim 1 also includes outer surfaces of the side walls being substantially tangent to outer surfaces of the cylindrical regions even though the outer surfaces do not define the inner volume.

Applicant and Examiner Crowell further discussed the rejection of claim 1 in view U. S. Patent No. 5,730,801 (*Tepman, et al.*), alone and in combination with other references. Applicant submitted that no reference teaches an inner volume as defined by Applicant since the volume defined by the inner walls is not taught, shown, or suggested by any reference of record. Examiner Crowell concluded that claim 1 is not limited to the internal volume asserted by Applicant because claim 1 includes an internal volume of any shape as long as the outer surfaces have the substantially tangent relationship recited in claim 1.

Applicant asked whether revision of claim 1 to refer to inner surfaces of the substantially cylindrical regions and inner surfaces of the side walls to define the inner volume would be considered a new issue. Examiner Crowell responded that such an amendment would be a new issue requiring an RCE since the revision would not be based on inherency as asserted by Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)